Framing immigration

Framing Immigration: A Content Analysis of Newspapers in Hong Kong, Taiwan, the United Kingdom, and the United States

Shan-Jan Sarah Liu

University of Edinburgh

School of Social and Political Science

This study examines the media framings of immigration in Hong Kong, Taiwan, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Using a content analysis of over 1,700 newspaper articles in different cases in 2014, my findings show that, regardless of context, the media use a small number of frames to generalize and reduce immigration to a singular dimension by stereotyping and predominantly framing immigration. My analysis also suggests that the media do not always only have a binary representation of bad vs. good immigrants. Instead, the media's othering of immigrants is a complex process, suggesting ambivalence despite superficial affirmation. Although my findings also demonstrate that some national differences exist, common patterns can be found across contexts that share similar historical, cultural, social, economic, and political dimensions of immigration. As one of the first cross-regional comparisons of media framings, this research reflects the power dynamics between the elites and immigrants and offers implications for how the media reinforce stereotypes and outsider status of immigrants, with the potential to shape public opinion and policies regarding immigration.

As news frames are shared over time, journalists promote saliency through their deliberate selection and emphasis of certain facets of issues, steering the audience to process information in a certain way (Protess and McCombs 2016). The elites-controlled media, thereby, harbor the political force to define and distort reality (Entman 2007). Previous studies provide insight into how the media frame immigration focusing on single-cases in North America and Western Europe (e.g. Caviedes 2015; Bloemraad et al. 2015; Blinder and Jeannet 2017). While western democracies are not exclusive in experiencing large-scale immigration, our understanding of the role of contexts[1] in the media is limited because cross-regional comparisons are rare. Building on scholarship suggesting that frames are a "power mechanism" (Van Gorp 2007, 63) and a "central part of a culture and are institutionalized in various ways" (Goffman 1981, 63), this paper, uses a content analysis of over 1,700 newspaper articles published in 2014 in Hong Kong, Taiwan, the United Kingdom, and the United States, to explore the framings of immigration. As one of the first cross cross-regional comparison, my analysis offers an updated, comprehensive overview of the media framings in these cases that have experienced considerable ongoing immigrant inflow. This study considers both episodic and thematic frames by examining a one-year- period, observing subtle changes in discourse across multiple events.

Although my analysis shows national differences, the media generally lack originality as immigration is framed in a small number of ways, largely as economic and cultural issues despite the presence of a wide range of immigration issues. My analysis also suggests that the U.K./U.S. media are much more simplified in their framing of immigration – as a threat – whereas H.K, and Taiwan do not mirror their western counterparts and emphasize other aspects of immigration.

[1] Context is referred to the historical, demographic, economic, and political context of immigration. Details are explained the "Immigration in Cross-Regional Contexts" section.

My findings offer two important implications. First, the media, across contexts, only use a small set of frames to frame immigration, reducing immigration into uncompounded dimensions by stereotyping, enabling the problematization of immigration without considering government accountability and neglecting other important aspects of immigration. My study illustrates that the media universally marginalize immigrants in a complex way. Second, similar cases may share similar media framings, which is especially apparent in the U.K./U.S. media. A majority of the U.K./U.S. media frame immigration as a threat while H.K./Taiwan frame immigration as cultural integration along with other aspects of immigration. For example, the H.K. and Taiwanese media paint a more humanistic picture and valorize the worth of immigrants by their contributions while highlighting governmental support, implying that immigrants' success is only possible through help from the state. Taken together, these findings contribute to the understanding of how immigration is politicized and fits the broader narratives within varying national discourses.

Media Framings of Immigration

Research shows journalistic biases emerge when reporting on immigration. For example, the media manipulate news by developing a threat narrative, dehumanizing immigrants, portraying them as dangerous to the community, and treating them like scapegoats for social problems (Esses et al. 2013; Greenberg and Hier 2001; Benson and Wood 2015). Also, scholarship suggests that the media take a humanitarian approach when framing immigration. For instance, immigrants in South Korea are often portrayed as "victims of racism, exploitation, violence and general human rights violations" (Park 2014, 1574). Although these frames depart from the negative representation of immigration, they still imply that immigrants must earn approval based on their heroic characteristics and actions, as well as their need to be saved. Hence, building on Hamlin's (2016) findings showing the media's generalization of immigrants, I argue that the media frame immigration in a rather simplified and homogeneous way by portraying immigration as problematic and threatening. Moreover, I suspect that even when the

media frame immigration in a humanitarian way, they tend to highlight immigrants' contributions as well as their need to be emancipated by the state.

While journalists' framing of immigration seems like an individual choice, much of it is interactive with the culture (van Gorp 2007). Culture does not form overnight; yet, much research focuses on the media's quick and extensive reactions to a single event (e.g. Antony and Thomas 2016), enhancing the understanding of the mainstream discourse in the midst of external shocks. For example, evidence shows that security is the major concern in the western world post-9/11 (Ahmad 2006). However, events may catalyze news; nevertheless, debates extend beyond single incidents. The media can also bring out concerns throughout time, normalizing the discourse surrounding immigration. For instance, as the Islam-as-threat frame normalizes (Roggeband and Vilegenthart 2007), the media no longer exclusively embed in national security but instead further construct Muslims as a threat to national identity because of their perceived segregation (Brighton 2007). Therefore, I argue that framing largely depends on the experiences of a society. The media account for varying levels of newsworthy characteristics to reflect past, present, and future issue saliency. For instance, although unemployment rate may not directly relate to immigration, when the economy suffers from poor performance, people tend to support the extreme right, stimulating anti-immigrant movements (Arzheimer 2009). As the media serve as both the civic forum and a filter for information, I expect the media in each context to correspond with salient issues and experiences that have been a part of a cultural phenomenon. While I do not expect all receiving countries to have the same exact findings, I suspect that similar cases share similar framings.

Immigration in Cross-Regional Contexts

To examine contextual variation in the media, I mitigate case selection bias by combining the most similar method, comparing cases that are similar across background conditions, and the most different method, comparing cases that are different across background conditions Although this research, like most studies, is unable to match exactly all background conditions

across all cases (Seawright and Gerring 2008), I identify four dimensions – historical, demographic, economic, and political – across cases enabling me to approximate the similarities and differences of contexts. Therefore, I compare two pairs of most similar cases that share inter-differences. The U.K. and the U.S. are similar to each other while H.K and Taiwan are similar to each other. At the same time, the U.K./U.S. pair and the H.K/Taiwan pair are different from each other.

Firstly, the U.K. and the U.S. share similar historical trends whereas H.K. and Taiwan share similar ones. The U.K. and the U.S. have been the top destination countries for immigrants whereas H.K. and Taiwan have only transitioned from sending to receiving cases in the last two decades. As Table 1 shows, the U.S. has attracted the largest absolute number of immigrants while the U.K. comes close to having one of the largest net migration rates; H.K. and Taiwan, in comparison, receive fewer immigrants. Newcomers might have been common in H.K. and Taiwan throughout history, mostly from China; yet, these newcomers' identities may not have been seen as foreigners. It was not until both H.K. and Taiwan opened up for labor and marriage migrants in the 1990s when foreigner population significantly diversified and became a concern. The differences in immigrant proportions between the U.S./U.K. and H.K,/Taiwan cases lead to the assumption that the western media may be more likely to utilize a threatening frame than the eastern media since a larger presence of immigrants may also create an illusion that a problem has emerged.

[Table 1 here]

Secondly and demographically, immigrants in these cases vary in gender, race, ethnicity, countries of origin, religion, and other characteristics. Immigrants in the U.S. and the U.K. share more similarities as they are ethnically and religiously diverse, coming from Latin America, Europe, and all over the world. Conversely, the immigrant populations in H.K. and Taiwan are less racially and ethnically different but more diverse in gender as they have been a top destination for women migrating for marriage or temporary work from neighboring countries.

As immigrant population and composition are part of the structure in which immigrants live, the immigrant presence may influence the way the media reflect the so-called reality. Thus, it is reasonable to suspect that because greater heterogeneity exists between the immigrant and native populations in the U.K. and the U.S., the media may create a threatening sensation when framing immigration. On the other hand, because there is less diversity between the immigrant and native populations and because there are more migrant women than men in H.K. and Taiwan, the media may be less likely to frame immigration as a threat.

Thirdly and economically, H.K. and Taiwan receive immigrants as a result of a very tightly regulated but also highly advocated guest-worker program on the basis of their economic needs whereas such program is less implemented and the bar is much higher to attain such visa in the U.K. and the U.S. The normalization of guest-worker programs in H.K. and the Taiwan also mean that less unauthorized migration may be present than in the U.K. and the U.S. where the governments do not actively recruit (or to the same extent as H.K. and Taiwan) guest workers from neighboring countries to meet economic needs. Consequently, I expect that the U.K. and the U.S. to frame immigration as threatening at a higher rate than H.K. and Taiwan.

Fourthly, these various conditions have political implications. For example, both the U.K. and the U.S. have experienced immigrant inflow and criticisms of immigration policies in recent years. The former U.S. President Obama proposed an immigration overhaul, reflecting, as well as leading to debates about DACA and the DREAM Act. The former U.K. Prime Minister Cameron was confronted with the European Union's open-door policy, mandating that migrants of the EU member countries must be allowed to enter. Furthermore, immigration was believed to be what led to UKIP's victory in the 2015 general elections and support for Brexit. On the contrary, native citizens in H.K. and Taiwan generally do not oppose these guest-worker programs as they recognize the need for such help. Instead, the public may even push the government to open up the border for more cheap labor from nearby countries. Such

differences in the political reactions toward immigration may also lead to differences in how the U.K./U.S. and H.K./Taiwanese media frame immigration.

In sum, the western/eastern cases share inter-differences in historical, demographic, economic, and political characteristics. These various dimensions are relevant to how the media may construct rhetoric surrounding immigration. Thus, not only are these four cases ideal to study, but they can also represent "a population of cases that is much larger than the case itself" (Seawright and Gerring 2008, 294), allowing me to conduct up-to-date cross-regional comparison as a steppingstone to future research on how similar/different cases, particularly the under-explored ones, may lead to similar/different media framings.

Data and Methodology

I compare the content of H.K., Taiwan, the U.K., and the U.S. newspaper[2] articles published in 2014. I first employ relevant keyword searches in the three most circulated and ideologically[3] diverse publications in each case. The newspapers include *Headline Daily*, *Oriental*

[2] Non-traditional media are more open to contributions made by ordinary citizens, preventing me from capturing the power dynamics between the elites and immigrants.

[3] I examine newspapers that have the most readership in the nation and that represent ideological diversity ranging from conservative to liberal. The U.K. is an exception, with the top three most circulated newspapers being tabloids: *The Sun*, *Daily Mail*. and *Metro*. My initial search of the articles in *Daily Mail* and *Metro* does not result in a substantial number of articles to analyze (less than 10 each on the randomly selected days). However, *The Sun* offers enough articles to analyze. Given that it is the most circulated newspaper outlet in the U.K., its inclusion is necessary to understand how the mainstream media frame immigration in the U.K. Furthermore, *The Daily Telegraph* and *The Times* are less ideologically diverse than newspapers in other countries as they are more right-wing and centered. However, the liberal media in the U.K., such as *The Guardian*, does not make it to top five in terms of readership. To ensure that I

Daily News, *Hong Kong Apple Daily*, *Taiwan Apple Daily*, *The Liberty Times*, *The United Daily News*, *The Sun*, *Daily Telegraph*, *The Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The New York Times*, *and USA Today.*[4] Articles are sought from national newspapers archives using both the English and Chinese terms "immigration," "immigrant," "alien," "migrant," "asylum seeker[5]," "refugee," "undocumented," "unauthorized," "guest worker," and "international student[6]." I pretest the searches based on these keywords prior to data collection to ensure that they comprehensively cover a wide range of references to immigration and migration. Then, I draw a representative sample consisting of articles published on one randomly chosen day of every week in 2014 to avoid oversampling of events that may have received much media attention on consecutive days. This method also

---

truly capture the mainstream discourse, as well as the source from which most people receive information, I sample *The Daily Telegraph* and *The Times*. Such decision may result in a limitation of a comprehensive picture of a diverse variety of media frame immigration in the U.K; at the same time, my selection of British newspapers reflect what is most read in the country.

[4] All newspapers in these cases share the same liberal model of the media system (Hallin and Mancini 2004).

[5] While the term "asylum seeker" may be used more frequently in the U.K. than in other cases, it is crucial to include asylum seekers as they are a substantive group of migrants. Excluding them may result in a bias in my sample. Moreover, the term "refugee" is also included in my keyword search of the H.K., U.S., and Taiwan media in both English and Mandarin to avoid under-sampling immigration related to asylum-seeking.

[6] Although international students are often excluded in prior studies, my analysis includes them because like other immigrants, they live in a country for an extended period and may have the intention to stay beyond their programs. In the U.K., for example, international students outnumber refugees in recent years and are also accounted for the net migration statistics utilized by policymakers (Blinder and Allen 2016).

helps comprehend how the frames may be generalizable for both the time before and after an external shock should it occur. This method generates a sample of 1,731 articles, including news, editorials, opinion columns, features, and other coverage, in the four cases. The majority of the newspaper articles related to immigration are reports of factual news or events (see Table A1 in the Appendix). I consider all news-related searches relevant and include them in the sample.[7]

Next, I analyze the frames—devices through which the reporters use to convey meaning. Particularly, as framing is defined as "the process by which people develop a particular conceptualization of an issue or reorient their thinking about an issue" (Chong and Druckman 2007, 104), journalists construct reality by taking a position on immigration and making it an issue about which the public should worry (Bateson 1972). For example, immigration itself may not be economic-centered; however, journalists have the authority to make immigration an economic threat by providing unemployment statistics when reporting immigrant inflow. Thereby, readers are instructed and encouraged to associate immigration with economic and monetary values and losses.

Adopting Chong and Druckman's (2007) suggestions of the most compelling steps to study frames, I begin with a three-step inductive approach. First, I identify key issues, events, and themes of coverage on immigration because "a frame in communication can be defined only in relation to a specific issue, event, or political actor" (106). Second, isolating a specific attitude to understand the potential impact of the frame is important (Chong and Druckman 2007); therefore, I determine the attitudes by evaluating the articles' position by examining their positive/negative representation of immigration/immigrants. Third, I evaluate how the reporters

[7] Some articles are indirectly related to immigration but are still coded. For example, an article may be about the opening of a community center where an immigrant is quoted suggesting the integration aspect of immigrants in the community. Thus, articles like these are not ignored in my analysis.

present issues, themes, statistics, quotations, ideologies, tones, and political actors as suggested by van Gorp, 2007). Also, following van Gorp's (2010) recommendations of dissecting stereotypes, myths, values, and narratives and by focusing on metaphors, examples, catchphrases, depictions, and visual images to determine the frame, I evaluate how these articles express commonly shared notions of immigration and create a coding scheme. As advocated by Chong and Druckman (2007), prototypes guide my coding and allow me the flexibility to discover any possible frame. Going beyond prior literature as a basis, this multi-layered process helps me determine the frames.

To finalize data collection, four additional coders then use a deductive analysis to examine the same sampled articles. Following strict guidelines, the coders have very little freedom in interpreting the text, enabling the analysis to be as subjective as possible. I also pay attention to inter-coder reliability during the process.[8] We discuss disagreed coding by revising the coding instructions regularly to address any reliability issues early.[9]

Results: Frames

My data suggest that the key frames that appear in H.K., Taiwan, the U.K., and the U.S. are *economic threat*, *cultural threat*, *cultural integration*, *economic contribution*, *immigrants are criminals*, *immigrants are victims*, and *policy reform*. The limited set of frames suggests that the media discourse

[8] The inter-coding agreement of each variable is cross-examined in two steps. The first two coders code all newspapers articles in the sample. We reach an average agreement at 0.94 in Holsti's coefficient. To further ensure that the coding agreement is reliable, the next two coders code 25% of the newspaper articles in the sample that is randomly selected. I then run a Krippendorff's alpha test and reach a score of 0.89. The bootstrapping also shows that there is a 2.98% chance that the Kalpha would be lower than 0.80 (a score that is considered a good reliability test) if the entire sample is included.

[9] See the Appendix for details about the codebook.

surrounding immigration is homogeneous across contexts. As the following sections depict, the media do not dichotomize the good/bad immigrants as there is no purely positive/negative representation. Instead, the media's othering of immigrants is ambivalent.

Economic Threat Frame (ETF)

ETF centers on the (perceived) negativity of immigration on the economy, suggesting that immigration is more of a threat than a promise, illuminating the fear of labor competition and fiscal status. *ETF* labels immigrants as job seekers, takers, and stealers. Moreover, *ETF* also suggests that immigration is the cause of economic turmoil. *ETF* also highlights economic burdens immigration imposes upon the government or taxpayers by presenting the cost to strengthen border control or fund welfare for immigrants. For example, the British media quote conservative organizations like Migration Watch UK to show that immigrants "between 1995 and 2011 cost the taxpayer more than £140 billion, or £22 million a day" (Barrett 2014). The U.S. also media stress the required expenses to support border security, which is apparent in an article that begins with "President Obama asked Congress on Tuesday for $3.7 billion" even when evidence confirms that migrant workers are more productive than citizens, pay taxes, and only constitute five percent of the work force in the U.S. and that they (Gee et al. 2016). These accusations of economic burdens mainstream the misassumption that immigration is economically threatening.

Economic Contribution Frame (ECF)

ECF portrays immigrants as human capital and suggests that their worth lies in their economic contribution. As opposed to being job seekers, immigrants are job creators and revenue generators. *ECF* accentuates wealthy investors' economic contribution. *ECF* includes the amount of money immigrants invest and the number of workers immigrants hire in order to gain citizenship, implying that immigration aids the economy.

Although *ECF* seems affirmative, it is still ambivalent as it valorizes immigrants by equating their worth entirely to their economic value. Such valorization of immigrants also

suggests certain qualifications of immigrants in order to be portrayed as contributing members of the economy. Such frame reinforces the neoliberal discourse that emphasizes individual success and fails to ensure that the government takes responsibility for economic growth.

Moreover, *ECF* uses words like selling and auctioning to describe resident/citizen status that immigrant investors exchange. *ECF* questions whether immigrants' investments are up to par with the number of benefits they receive, reminding the readers that immigrants do not solely invest for the sake of national economy but for permanent residency or citizenship they receive in return. A British article questions the Tier 1 Investor Program and depicts the negative connotation behind the economic contribution of foreign investors by stating, "Hundreds of Russian oligarchs and Chinese millionaires have won the right to settle in Britain in return for a minimum £1 million in gilts." This frame implies that states benefit from this exchange, but the benefit also lies in the cost of nationhood.

Cultural Threat Frame (CTF)

CTF emphasizes the transformation of a nation by portraying immigration as demographically changing and culturally threatening and implying the difficulty in preserving national boundaries and homogeneity by using alarming statistics (Helbling 2013). *CTF* uses words like "flood" and "pour" to describe immigration and utilizes visual cues and immigrants' country of origins to imply that no space exists for multiculturalism.

CTF constructs an image that immigration transforms the native identity, language, and ideology. *CTF* also intersects with immigrants' visible identities: race, ethnicity, and religion, among others. For example, immigrants' "coloring" of the country is a common occurrence. *CTF* suggests that societies must fear multiculturalism and diversity and illuminates the general lack of embracement of the fluidity in national identity. *CTF* depicts the extent to which the receiving country has to accommodate to the outsiders, suggesting only the cost of immigration and fostering an anxiety of what such transformation may look like racially, ethnically, religiously, and culturally. While *CTF* may discuss immigrants rather than immigration, these depictions are

generalized rather than individualized as *CTF* treats immigrants as an entity and neglect their individual experiences and identities.

Cultural Integration Frame (CIF)

CIF normalizes the presence of immigrants and establishes the notion that the nation is filled with people from varying origins making ends meet. *CIF* tells stories of human interest, bringing a human face to the media coverage of immigration. As *CIF* records immigrants' activities, the media depict immigrants as becoming societal members.

CIF also demonstrates that immigrants must assimilate in order to win affirmation. *CIF* allows immigrants to diversify the community with a caveat—such diversification must remain in the context of food and clothing. Rarely, however, does *CIF* applaud immigrants' transformation of a nation's language, religion, or culture. Much of the introduction of immigrant culture remains shallow since the media only praise multiculturalism on several occasions throughout the year, e.g. holidays of immigrants' homeland.

Although *CIF* describes the receiving country as "compassionate, immigrant-receiving" (Chavez 2001), it also highlights the affirmative aspects of immigration through the hardship the immigrants endure to emerge as community members and to create new, promising, and prosperous lives. Immigrants' membership and success depend on their effort to be a part of a community (Viswanath and Arora 2000). Sacrificing immigrants become the poster child (Ihlen and Thorbjornsrud 2014). Implicitly suggested, though, is the labor that assimilation requires. By stressing such integration, the media perpetuate the immigrant heritage but also imply the importance of holding onto the nation's values and traditions. Even when *CIF* normalizes immigrants' presence, their outsider status is still visible, separating them from native citizens and strengthening the "us and them" division (Sieglinde and Stockl 2016).

Immigrants are Criminals Frame (ICF)

ICF employs stereotypes of immigrants as criminals,[10] echoing previous findings that immigrants may be, although not always, portrayed as criminals (e.g. Fryberg et al. 2012). *ICF* constructs a sense of mass presence of "illegal" immigrants by employing statistics to emphasize the degree to which immigrants engage in criminal convictions and questioning why they are not deported. Specifically, in H.K. and Taiwan where many immigrants are guest workers, *ICF* is likely to highlight migrant workers who stay illegally beyond the approved time and commit crimes. When incidents involving guest workers occur, *ICF* stresses their identity as "illegally escaped" immigrants but rarely provides a personal account of immigrants' motivation to run away, reiterating their potential threat to domestic security. The linkage between immigrants' fleeing status and violence suggests that immigrants are dangerous, creating an image that the nation is undergoing a "crimmigration" crisis, which not only challenges domestic security but also the sovereignty of the nation (Stumpf 2006).

Immigrants are Victims Frame (IVF)

Not only does *IVF* realize the hardship that immigrants experience in host country, but it also pays tribute to immigrants who diligently pursue their dreams. *IVF* constructs a notion of a nation of hardworking immigrants who are willing to make sacrifices to be members of a community. However, *IVF* suggests the obsession of immigrants' performance of hard work and validates that the receiving country is the one that can provide better means and offer promises to victims. For instance, a Taiwanese article discusses the lack of resources for children in rural villages. While this article focuses on income inequality between the rural and the urban areas, a teacher was quoted "Kids in the villages come from households with single parents,

[10] This paper does not examine the identity of immigrants or the type of immigration in the media like some literature does (e.g. Blinder and Allen 2016). Thus, any article that highlights immigrants' identity or immigration type as illegal would not be coded as *ICF*, which is strictly reporting related to criminal activities.

migrant mothers, and low in-come. The more we can save the better." *IVF* presents victims as weak in order to garner sympathy and recognition of the public. Not only does *IVF* reinforce the assumption that immigrants are vulnerable, but it also suggests that immigrants must depend on others—native citizens— to be saved.

Policy Reform Frame (PRF)

The media also frame immigration from the legal perspective, highlighting the need to fix existing immigration laws: restricting immigration and open door/protection of immigrants. *PRF* reflects a sense of frustration resulted from the lack of satisfaction with the effectiveness of immigration policies. On the one hand, *PRF* blames the government for its lack of control over immigration inflow and urges action as it captures the public demand for the government to close the borders and implement immigration quota. On the other hand, *PRF* advocates for government actions to protect and recognize immigrant rights. *PRF* calls for a more lenient policy by emphasizing immigrants' contributions, which, however, differs from their economic contribution. *PRF* situates immigrants' contribution within the intersections of the need for labor and the cheap labor immigrants provide. For example, opening up the door for more healthcare workers is a common rhetoric when discussing the future of long-term care in H.K. *PRF* does not discuss healthcare workers' contribution based on how much they alleviate employers' burdens. Instead, immigrants' cheap labor is the reason for the government to ease the application process for foreign healthcare workers.

Additionally, *PRF* discusses immigration through the rights, legal protection, and recognition that immigrants deserve. *PRF*, although progressive, does not equate to support for immigration. Rather, *CRF* advocates for controlling immigration with the ultimate goal to make receiving countries better off. For example, the discussion on migrant workers' minimum wage in Taiwan occurs not because migrant workers deserve minimum rage, rather, without paying them minimum wage, native Taiwanese citizens' job opportunities are threatened. In other

words, the interest of the state still precedes the interest of immigrants despite a seemingly humanitarian approach.

Results: Comparative Patterns

As Table 2 reports, not one unique frame dominates the media; however, only seven popular frames exist. Among the small set of frames, economic and cultural impacts are the main frames, making up 78% across all four cases. Specifically, 36% of the newspapers frame immigration as an economic threat; 7% of the newspapers frame immigration as an economic contribution. This finding shows that when the media frame immigration as an economic issue, they are significantly more likely to shed a negative light on immigrants' impact. In contrast, 18% and 17% of the newspapers frame immigration as either a cultural threat or cultural contribution, respectively.

[Tables 2]While common patterns emerge in the type of frames employed by these cross-national media, the media frames in each context vary. When disaggregating frames by case, the U.K. and the U.S. share more similarities with each other while H.K. and Taiwan share some similarities with each other and do not mirror the U.K./U.S. findings. As Table 3[11] shows, the British and American media are more likely to employ a threat frame, at 79% of the total U.K. sample and 89% of the U.S. sample, whereas the H.K. and Taiwanese media do not mirror the U.K.'s and the U.S.'s overwhelming threat frames. The following sections discuss the several hegemonic, as well as auxiliary frames in the U.K./U.S. and the H.K./Taiwanese media in detail.

[Tables 3]

The U.K. and the U.S. Frames

[11] Specific details about findings on only news items can be found in Table A2 in the Appendix, which shows that the results do not change much.

ETF dominates the British and American media, followed by the cultural threat frame, whereas the cultural integration frame dominates the H.K and Taiwanese media, followed by other frames. This outcome is consistent with extant evidence suggesting that *ETF* is not unusual in countries that are part of the global economy (Sassen 1999). In maintaining the global neo-liberal order, economic issues are given much media attention in North America and Europe (Caviedes 2015; Greussing and Boomgaarden 2017). Unlike H.K. and Taiwan, the U.K. and the U.S. do not have systematic, strict guest worker programs where migrants provide cheap but considered necessary labor. Therefore, the higher frequency of the *ETF* in the U.K. and the U.S. could be resulted from a fear of unauthorized immigrant inflow as it is a major mean for people to migrate.[12]

The second most used frame in the U.K. and the U.S. is also a threat frame. *CTF* dominates the U.K. and the U.S. media whereas it only comprises of a small proportion of the H.K. and Taiwanese media. The U.K. and the U.S. receive immigrants with diverse backgrounds from all over the world whereas the majority of immigrants in H.K. and Taiwan are ethnically

[12] *ECF*, which goes hand in hand with ETF, is one of the least employed frames in all four cases. It is especially unlikely to see *ECF* in the U.S. media (at only 2%). My study cannot explain the reason why *ECF* is under-employed, even in cases like H.K. and Taiwan, where migrant labor is often considered relevant and necessary. However, it suggests that perhaps even in cases where migrant labor is systematically imported by the government and considered crucial by the public, immigrants cannot be recognized for their economic contribution. This finding also has important implications as studies show that economic contribution frames are less likely to stimulate readers to problematize immigration (Igarua et al. 2011).

Asian.[13] As literature suggests that multiculturalism could create a backlash on the acceptance of immigrants (McLaren 2003), such diversity may explain why the British and American media frame immigration as a cultural threat at a higher rate than the H.K. and Taiwan media. However, as H.K. and Taiwan continue to experience increasing heterogeneity, a follow-up analysis could help understand how the discourses of immigration could alter as multiculturalism increases.

Interestingly, the British and American media do not use *IVF* at all. Their dehumanization of immigrants contradicts some prior research (e.g. Steimel 2010), suggesting that recent western media have less interest in humanizing immigrants. This result departs from van Gorp's findings in 2005 but advocates a further analysis of media's vicitimization of immigrants over time. Also, as data prior to when the Syrian refugee crisis are analyzed, future research needs to examine the media's potential shift in 2015 to a human-interest fame.

Also unanticipated is the lack of emphasis on the security aspect in the western media while both H.K. and Taiwan portray immigrants as criminals. Crimmigation has been one of the concerns in the U.K. in 2014 as the EU freedom of movement policy allows Eastern Europeans to enter the U.K. While no evidence supports that Eastern Europeans are more likely to be criminals, British media also do not overwhelmingly reflect this myth. Although this paper cannot explain the disconnection between my research and extant scholarship (e.g. Hamlin 2016), it suggests that perhaps the newspapers are less likely to frame immigration as a crimmigration crisis than tabloids since the number of newspaper articles is higher in my sample than tabloid articles. Moreover, this finding partly illustrates that the media perhaps do not react as quickly to external shocks as expected. Instead, as part of the process of culture, the media

[13] The majority of H.K.'s and Taiwan's citizens are of Han descendants that have migrated from China since the 16th century with a peak during the 1949 Chinese Civil war. More recently, H.K. and Taiwan receive many marriage migrants from China and Southeast Asia.

may rely on the past when framing immigration. In other words, the various contextual factors of each case matter for how the media prioritize their framings of immigration.

The H.K. and Taiwan Frames

Contrary to the U.K. and the U.S., the H.K. and Taiwanese media do not predominantly use a threat frame to report immigration. Instead, *CIF* has the highest frequency there, which is not surprising given their distinct immigrant histories and populations. Immigration is not a new phenomenon and its immigrant population has always been homogeneous, which might explain the overarching *CIF*. *CIF* has implications for H.K. and Taiwan's acceptance of immigrants as Bos et al.'s experiment (2016) demonstrates that exposure to a multicultural frame that celebrates diversity leads to positive reactions toward immigrants. *CIF*'s domination of the H.K. and Taiwanese media reflects that as these two cases becomes a nation of immigrants, they glorify the immigrant narrative by appropriating them as sympathetic and welcoming to immigrants (Quinsaat 2014). The eastern media may portray immigrants favorably; such favorable position, nevertheless, almost always comes with ambivalence—immigrants must act like a contributing member who has integrated to avoid deviant depictions. That is, H.K. and Taiwan, on the one hand, see multiculturalism as an asset that enhances their quality of life (Roggeband and Vilegenthart 2007); on the other hand, suggests that membership must be attained by immigrants themselves.

Looking beyond the hegemonic frames, other media frames are also employed by H.K. and Taiwanese media. The H.K./Taiwanese media paint a humanistic picture of immigrants; nonetheless, they also victimize them. The presence of *IVF* in H.K. and Taiwan suggests the media's invocation of unmotivated sympathies, which also has a "deleterious effect on perceptions toward and about immigration as audiences are exposed to reductionist and stereotypical representations of immigrant narratives" (Sowards and Pineda 2013, p. 73). *IVF* in H.K. and Taiwan is also not surprising as similar evidence is shown in other East Asian literature (e.g. Park 2014). Again, I suspect that the composition of immigrant population in East Asia—

migrant workers and marriage migrants—shape journalists' decision in portraying immigrants. More specifically, many people also emigrate out of H.K. and Taiwan, their own citizens' diaspora may explain why the media may depict immigrants as victims to show that immigrants must overcome hardship and mistreatment in order to make the country stronger.

H.K. and Taiwanese media's portrayal of immigrants as contributing member or a victim paints a humanistic experience of individual immigrants rather than success or vulnerability of immigrants as a collective group. While these humanistic frames seem progressive, their focus on individualistic experiences reflects individual immigrants' sacrifice, hard work, and contribution. Such framing does not suggest understanding or supporting immigration but instead neglects the broader structural issues of immigration (Benson 2013). Moreover, even when the media do not oppose immigration, the humanitarian frames reflect the elites' differentiation of the type of immigrants that are accepted—those that need the state's savior or those that contribute to the economy and multiculturalism of the receiving country.

While *IVF* are popular frames in H.K. and Taiwan, *PRF* is one of the hegemonic frames in H.K., although much coverage centers on one case—an employer's abuse of an Indonesian domestic worker., Erwiana, which stimulated a series of reports on the treatment of and working conditions for migrant workers. For example, the 17% of the sampled newspapers that frame immigration surrounding policy reform share a common call—a reexamination of guest worker policies to protect migrant workers' rights. Because of the high profile of this case, *PRF* is highly salient. Almost zero legal protection frame exists in the H.K. media when excluding any article related to this particular case.

However, Taiwan differs from H.K. in its framing of immigration from the legal aspect as only 6% of the sampled newspapers discuss the need for an immigration overhaul. This result contradicts a common assumption that a reform for immigration policies is the center of focus since the student-led movement was active in 2014. Very

few British and American newspapers, approximately 3%, highlight immigration policies, which also contradicts the common belief that the media report extensively on the immigration overhaul even when the national leaders experience pressure to respond. Although many newspapers discuss immigration reforms in the U.K. and the U.S., many articles frame immigration as an economic or cultural issue as previously demonstrated. The little emphasis of reevaluating national policies to protect the interest of workers reflects the little interest of elites in ensuring the safety and rights of immigrants. Especially in the case of H.K., my analysis suggests that it takes a horrible incident to happen for migrants to be recognized.

In addition to stereotyping immigrants as victims, prior scholarship (Farris and Mohamed 2018) consistently shows that the media portray immigrants as criminals. Nonetheless, surprising in my research is the relatively low frequency of *ICF*. Only 7% of the total sampled newspapers frame immigration as a threat to security. *ICF* constitute 15% of the sampled Taiwanese newspapers and 9% of the sampled H.K newspapers center on the security aspect. My results are not divergent from Park's (2014) findings on South Korean newspapers' association of immigration with crimes and diseases. I suspect that these similar findings may be because of the many shared characteristics among East Asian cases[14].

In sum, although my research cannot explain why the media frame immigration the way they do, it illustrates that cases sharing parallel experiences of immigration are also more likely to be similar in their mainstream discourses. The findings show that the U.K. and the U.S. media are more monolithic in how they frame immigration – the majority of frames center around threat, suggesting that they tend to create an image of the huddle masses of immigrants by focusing on a generalized collective group of immigrants rather than individual immigrants. The common characteristics of the U.K. and the U.S. discussed previously may explain why the

[14] The majority of immigrants are marriage or labor migrants.

media portray immigrants as threatening. Conversely, the H.K./Taiwanese media employ a greater variety of media frames, which emphasize integration, victimization, criminality, and policy reform. H.K. and the Taiwan have the most different background conditions from the U.K. and the U.S., which may explain their different frames. My research serves as a steppingstone to understanding why immigration is framed more monolithically and threatening in the western media than the eastern media and more importantly, to understanding how context matters in the mainstream discourse surrounding immigration.

Conclusion

My content analysis raises several important implications. First, my findings illustrate that the media, across contexts, use a small set of mechanisms to frame immigration. Most of these frames are negative or ambivalent at best. Contrary to popular assumption, my analysis illustrates that the media also depart from the representation of immigration as bad. The media may show support for immigration, such as through their emphasis of the cultural integration of immigrants. Nonetheless, the media's support of immigration implies that approval must be earned as immigrants' outsider status remains visible. This caveat echoes Benson's (2013) work on the U.S. and French news suggesting that news may take an affirmative position on immigration but are embedded in the hero frames. This outcome encourages more profound analysis of the potential adverse consequences of the seemingly humanistic coverage of immigration. My research also demonstrates that while the media frame immigration in different mechanisms, the media, nevertheless, still reduce the immigrant experience to commonly accepted assumptions. For example, in showing that immigrants survive hardship, the media depict immigrants as victims rather than agents. While this may be a strategy for the media to solicit support from the public, it also illustrates that the media have the power to influence the presentation and distribution of information.

Second, although countries differ in their dominant news frames of immigration, my findings reveal that some patterns exist. Countries that share similar characteristics are also more

likely to employ similar frames than countries that are distinct, suggesting that media frames may not necessarily be geographically bounded but instead bounded by other conditions. For example, the H.K./Taiwan media do not mirror the overwhelming focus on threat in the U.K. and the U.S. Instead, the Hong Kong and Taiwanese media frame immigration as cultural integration and also emphasize other aspects of immigration, such as criminality and victimization. As previously explained, these cross-regional differences could be a result of the historical, demographic, economic, and political differences between the east and the west.

Consequently, my findings suggest that the media framings of immigration could attribute to contextual differences; however, limitations exist—my sample is not representative of all media in these four cases and my case selection is not representative of all receiving countries that may share different or similar characteristics. As a multi-case study of a brief period, this also analysis lacks the feasibility to provide a causal explanation for the regional variation of the media constructions of immigration. However, since migration occurs across the world, my cross-regional comparison helps contextualize the media framing of immigration, especially in previously ignored area. More importantly, the cross-regional comparison is rare and yet is a channel to future examination of whether extant media framing theories and findings travel across geographical boundaries. My findings are exploratory. Its attempt at addressing a gap in current literature—the limited scholarship on media framings of immigration in Asia — raises implications for comparative studies of this region. More sophisticated and detailed data is required to conduct a more profound comparison of cross-regional differences in the media.

Furthermore, while my research also offers implications for how the media sustain and consolidate asymmetrical power relationships between the elites and immigrants, it calls for a deeper analysis of the role of various identities of immigrants in the media framings of immigration. Especially since gender and race are constructed differently in the west and the east, the next step would be to examine the gendering and racialization of the media in contexts that share similar and different historical, cultural, social, and political dimensions. Future research of

these different factors, e.g. immigrants' identities as well as contextual factors, in shaping the media's construction of immigration enables the understanding of the intersectionality of unequal power relations.

References

Ahmad, F., 2006. British Muslim perceptions and opinions on news coverage of September 11. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *32*(6), pp.961-982.

Antony, M.G. and Thomas, R.J., 2017. Stop sending your kids across our border: Discursively constructing the unaccompanied youth migrant. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, *10*(1), pp.4-24.

Arzheimer, K., 2009. Contextual factors and the extreme right vote in Western Europe, 1980–2002. *American Journal of Political Science*, *53*(2), pp.259-275.

Barrett, David. 2014. 850 Chinese Millionaires and Russian Oligarchs Have 'Brought' British Visa. *The Telegraph* February 25.

Bateson, Gregory. 1972. A Theory of Play and Fantasy', pp. 177–93 in Steps to an Ecology of Mind: A Revolutionary Approach to Man's Understanding of Himself. New York: Ballantine Books.

Bleich, E., Stonebraker, H., Nisar, H. and Abdelhamid, R., 2015. Media portrayals of minorities: Muslims in British newspaper headlines, 2001–2012. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *41*(6), pp.942-962.

Blinder, S. and Allen, W.L., 2016. Constructing immigrants: Portrayals of migrant groups in British national newspapers, 2010–2012. *International Migration Review*, *50*(1), pp.3-40.

Blinder, S., Jeannet, A. 2017. The "Illegal" and the Skilled: Effect of Media Portrayals on Perceptions of Immigrants in Britain. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1-19.

Bloemraad, I., de Graauw, E. and Hamlin, R., 2015. Immigrants in the Media: Civic Visibility in the USA and Canada. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *41*(6), pp.874-896.

Bradimore, A. and Bauder, H., 2011. Mystery ships and risky boat people: Tamil refugee migration in the newsprint media. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, *36*(4), p.637.

Brighton, S., 2007. British Muslims, multiculturalism and UK foreign policy: "integration" and "cohesion"in and beyond the state. *International Affairs*, *83*(1), pp.1-17.

Caviedes, A., 2015. An emerging "European"news portrayal of immigration?. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *41*(6), pp.897-917.

Chavez, L.R., 2001. *Covering immigration: Popular images and the politics of the nation*. University of California Press.

Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007. "Framing Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 10: 103–126.

Duyvendak, J. W., & Scholten, P. 2012. Deconstructing the Dutch multicultural model: A frame perspective on Dutch immigrant integration policymaking. Comparative European Politics, 10(3), 266–282.

Ehrkamp, P., 2010. The limits of multicultural tolerance? Liberal democracy and media portrayals of Muslim migrant women in Germany. *Space and Polity*, *14*(1), pp.13-32.

Entman, R.M., 2007. Framing bias: Media in the distribution of power. *Journal of communication*, *57*(1), pp.163-173.

Esses, V.M., Medianu, S. and Lawson, A.S., 2013. Uncertainty, threat, and the role of the media in promoting the dehumanization of immigrants and refugees. *Journal of Social Issues*, *69*(3), pp.518-536.

Farris, E.M. and Silber Mohamed, H., 2018. Picturing immigration: how the media criminalizes immigrants. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, pp.1-11.

Fryberg, S.A., Stephens, N.M., Covarrubias, R., Markus, H.R., Carter, E.D., Laiduc, G.A. and Salido, A.J., 2012. How the media frames the immigration debate: The critical role of location and politics. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *12*(1), pp.96-112.

Gee, L.C., Gardener, M. and Wiehe, M., 2016. Undocumented Immigrants' State & Local Tax Contributions. *The Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy*.

Greenberg, J. and Hier, S., 2001. Crisis, mobilization and collective problematization:" Illegal" Chinese migrants and the Canadian news media. *Journalism studies*, *2*(4), pp.563-583.

Greussing, E. and Boomgaarden, H.G., 2017. Shifting the refugee narrative? An automated frame analysis of Europe"s 2015 refugee crisis. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, pp.1-26.

Hallin, D.C. and Mancini, P., 2004. *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*. Cambridge university press.

Hamel, C.E., 2002. Muslim diaspora in Western Europe: The Islamic headscarf (hijab), the media and Muslims" integration in France. *Citizenship studies*, *6*(3), pp.293-308.

Helbling, Marc. 2014. "Framing Immigration in Western Europe." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40 (1): 21–41.

Hamlin, R. 2016. "Foreign Criminals," the Human Rights Act, and the New Constitutional Politics of the United Kingdom. *Journal of Law and Courts*, *4*(2), 437-461.

Hertog, J.K. and McLeod, D.M., 2001. A multiperspectival approach to framing analysis: A field guide. *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world*, *139*, p.161.

Ihlen, Ø., and Thorbjørnsrud, K. 2014. Making news and influencing decisions: Three threshold cases concerning forced return of immigrants. *European Journal of Communication*, 29(2), 139-152.

Igartua, J. J., Moral-Toranzo, F., & Fernández, I. 2011. Cognitive, attitudinal, and emotional effects of news frame and group cues, on processing news about immigration. Journal of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods, and Applications, 23(4), 174–185

Iyengar, S., 1994. *Is anyone responsible?: How television frames political issues*. University of Chicago Press.

McLaren, L.M., 2003. Anti-immigrant prejudice in Europe: Contact, threat perception, and preferences for the exclusion of migrants. *Social forces*, *81*(3), pp.909-936.

Powell, K.A., 2011. Framing Islam: An analysis of US media coverage of terrorism since 9/11. *Communication Studies*, *62*(1), pp.90-112.

Protess, D. and McCombs, M.E. eds., 2016. *Agenda setting: Readings on media, public opinion, and policymaking*. Routledge.

Quinsaat, S., 2014. Competing news frames and hegemonic discourses in the construction of contemporary immigration and immigrants in the United States. *Mass Communication and Society*, *17*(4), pp.573-596.

Roggeband, C. and Vliegenthart, R., 2007. Divergent framing: The public debate on migration in the Dutch parliament and media, 1995–2004. *West European Politics*, *30*(3), pp.524-548.

Rosenberger, S. and Stöckl, I., 2018. The politics of categorization–political representatives with immigrant background between "the other" and "standing for". *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, *6*(2), pp.217-236.

Sassen, Saskia. 1999. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: New Press.

Seawright, J. and Gerring, J., 2008. Case selection techniques in case study research: A menu of qualitative and quantitative options. *Political Research Quarterly*, *61*(2), pp.294-308.

Sessions, J. 2014, November 20. Congress must fix the problems President Obama"s executive amnesty plan creates. *U.S.A. Today*.

Shu, T. 2012, March 23. Legislator Chang: The more marriage migrants, the more left-over Taiwanese women. *The United Daily*.

So, A.Y., 2003. Cross-border families in Hong Kong: The role of social class and politics. *Critical Asian Studies*, *35*(4), pp.515-0534.

Sowards, S.K. and Pineda, R.D., 2013. Immigrant narratives and popular culture in the United States: Border spectacle, unmotivated sympathies, and individualized responsibilities. *Western Journal of Communication*, *77*(1), pp.72-91.

Steimel, S.J., 2010. Refugees as people: The portrayal of refugees in American human interest stories. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *23*(2), pp.219-237.

Stumpf, J., 2006. The The Crimmigration Crisis: Immigrants, Crime, and Sovereign Power. *Am. UL Rev.*, *56*, p.367.

Van Gorp, B. 2005. Where is the frame? Victims and intruders in the Belgian press coverage of the asylum issue. *European Journal of Communication*, 20(4), 484-507.

Van Gorp, B. 2007. The constructionist approach to framing: Bringing culture back in. *Journal of communication*, 57(1), 60-78.

Van Gorp, B. 2010. Strategies to take subjectivity out of framing analysis. *Doing news framing analysis: Empirical and theoretical perspectives*, 84-109.

Van Heerden, S., de Lange, S. L., van der Brug, W., & Fennema, M. 2014. The immigration and integration debate in the Netherlands: Discursive and programmatic reactions to the rise of anti-immigration parties. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 40(1), 119–136

Viswanath, K. and Arora, P., 2000. Ethnic media in the United States: An essay on their role in integration, assimilation, and social control. *Mass Communication & Society*, *3*(1), pp.39-56.

Table 1 Global and Regional Estimates on Immigrant Population

	Net Migration rate (per 1,000 population)	% immigrants among country's population	% female migrants
Hong Kong	1.68	8	77
Taiwan	0.9	4	64
United Kingdom	2.6	12	52
U.S.A.	3.38	14	50

Source: International Organisation of Migrants (2013)

Table 2 Types of Frames of Immigration across all Sampled Countries

Frame	Number	Percentage
Economic threat	622	36
Demographic/ cultural threat	317	18
Cultural integration	300	17
Economic contribution	130	7
Immigrants as criminals	113	7
Policy reform	103	6
Immigrants as victims	94	6
Other	52	3
Total	1,731	100

Table 3 Types of Frames of Immigration across all Sampled Countries, in percentage, by country

Frame	Economic threat	Cultural threat	Cultural integration	Economic contribution	Immigrants are criminals	Immigrants are victims	Policy reform	Other
H.K	14	3	24	8	8	13	17	13
Taiwan	8	11	39	8	15	12	6	1
U.K.	59	20	4	11	2	0	3	1
U.S.	58	31	3	2	0	0	3	3

Appendix

Table A1 Types of News in the Newspaper Sample in 2014 in Hong Kong, Taiwan, the U.K., and the U.S.

	News	Op-Ed	Feature	Editorial	Letters to the Editor	Other	Total N.
H.K	164 (89%)	4 (2%)	0 (0%)	14 (8%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	184
Taiwan	526 (86%)	16 (3%)	20 (3%)	4 (1%)	33 (5%)	10 (2%)	609
United Kingdom	239 (62%)	3 (1%)	32 (8%)	41 (11%)	59 (15%)	10 (3%)	384
U.S.A.	317 (59%)	56 (10%)	20 (4%)	26 (5%)	50 (9%)	85 (13%)	554
Total	1,246	79	72	85	143	106	1,731

Table A2 Types of Frames of Immigration excluding non-news across all Sampled Countries, in percentage, by country

Frame	Economic threat	Cultural threat	Cultural integration	Economic contribution	Immigrants are criminals	Immigrants are victims	Policy reform	Other
H.K	13	5	27	8	8	12	15	12
Taiwan	10	12	35	10	13	11	7	2
U.K.	60	22	3	8	4	0	2	1
U.S.	55	32	4	3	0	0	3	3